



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
09/721,862	11/25/2000	Paul Lapstun	NPT008USUS	3962
24011	7590	08/10/2005	EXAMINER	
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, 2041 AUSTRALIA			NGUYEN, KIMBERLY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/721,862

Applicant(s)

LAPSTUN ET AL.

Examiner

Kimberly D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-14 and 21-29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-14, 21, 28 and 29 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 22-27 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ✓ 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
✓ 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/1/05.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment

1. Acknowledgment is made of Request for Continued Examination and Amendment filed July 1, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 8-9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Connell et al. (US 5,554,842; hereinafter “Connell”).

Re claims 8 and 21: Connell teaches a method of coding a region (figs. 3-4) including applying coded data to a part of the region (17,18,19), the coded data indicating both a functional attribute of the part of the region and a relative location on the region, the method comprising the steps of:

printing the coded data on the relative location on the region using ink that is substantially invisible to the human eye (i.e., “sorting information may be encoded into bars 17, 18, and 19” col. 4, lines 28-30; col. 5, lines 11-15); and

printing visible content on the relative location, wherein the visible content corresponds to the coded data (“Bars 17, 18 and 19 may be printed by conventional printing methods” col. 4, lines 21-22; col. 4, lines 37-41);

Art Unit: 2876

wherein the visible content and the invisible coded data are printed by the same printer (col. 3, lines 4-37).

Re claim 9: Connell teaches sorting information, such as first class mail, second class mail, specialty mail, out of state mail, etc., may be encoded into bars 17, 18 and 19 using fluorescent ink (col. 4, lines 28-36; col. 2, lines 63-66), which is a text field.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10-14 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connell in view of Sekendur (US 5,477,012). The teachings of Connell have been discussed above.

Connell fails to teach or fairly suggest some of the coded data also includes data indicative of a location, an identity (claim 11), identity and a location (claim 12), a location in the region (claim 13), or an identity of the region (claim 14).

Sekendur teaches a surface, such as paper, which is formatted/imprinted with a position-related coding means, wherein the position-related coded data indicates the X-Y coordinates on the surface/paper to provide the exact position/location relative to the surface/paper to detect the information such as handwriting recognition, signature verification, fingerprint recognition, etc (figs. 1-2; col. 3, lines 1-25; col. 4, lines 15-59).

Art Unit: 2876

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the position-related coded data as taught by Sekendur to the teachings of Connell in order to provide a data space formatted with X-Y coordinated code to detect the information (such as a location, an identity, a fingerprint, a handwritten signature, etc.) based on the exact X-Y coordinated data.

6. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connell in view of Yagita (US 6,089,455). The teachings of Connell have been discussed above.

Connell fails to teach or fairly suggest the coded data comprising data bits represented by a radial wedge in the form of an area bounded by two radial lines, a radially inner arc and radially outer arc.

Yagita teaches the coded data comprising data bits represented by a radial wedge (e.g., X_1-A_1 , X_1-A_2 , X_2-A_2) in the form of an area bounded by two radial lines, a radially inner arc and radially outer arc (e.g., the concentric-circular areas E, D, C, B, A) (fig. 7; col. 6, line 49 through col. 7, line 10).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the coded data with concentric-circular areas as taught by Yagita to the teachings of Connell in order to correctly and rapidly recognize the code regardless of the direction of the code (Yagita, col. 4, lines 8-11).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 22-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2876

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Connell and/or Sekendur fails to specifically teach the coded data comprising a plurality of tags, wherein each tag includes six target structures consisting of a detection ring, an orientation axis target, and four perspective targets as set forth in claims 22-27.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-14 and 21-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The examiner respectfully believes that, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, Connell, Sekendur and Yagita meet the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fukuda et al. (US 6,131,807) teaches information recording medium and information reproduction system. Antognini et al. (US 6,820,807) teaches a method of formatting digital data and a method of decoding the formatted digital data. Mazaika (US 6,708,894) teaches a system and method for encoding digital data in a hardcopy rendering of an invisible image of circularly asymmetric dot patterns.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2402. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 571-272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kim Nguyen', with a stylized flourish at the end.

KDN

August 7, 2005